

**WASHINGTON STATE BOUNDARY REVIEW BOARD
FOR KING COUNTY**

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

February 12, 2004

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jim Denton convened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Van Anderson	Lloyd Baker
Chuck Booth	A. J. Culver
Ethel Hanis	Claudia Hirschey
Roger Loschen	Michael Marchand
Judy Tessandore	

III. ORIENTATION PROGRAM

Chandler Felt, King County Executive Office representative, made a presentation on the King County Annual Growth Report. He spoke first about the fact that the document is intended to identify major growth trends, provide information about benchmarks, and report standards for future growth. Mr. Felt spoke of the Highlights of the Report – including discussion of existing and anticipated Population Characteristics, Population, Growth Targets, Land Use Indicators, Residential Capacity and Anticipated Development, and Economic Development.

Mr. Felt reported of characteristics of the County at large. He spoke particularly about Unincorporated Areas, providing detailed data for Potential Annexation Areas, with a focus on the ten largest Potential Annexation Areas (PAAs). Mr. Felt also spoke about the various Special Purpose Districts which exist in King County.

More specifically, Mr. Felt noted that King County is experiencing a slowing rate of growth due to a reduction in immigration from other countries. The continuing economic challenges in this area are reducing the number of people moving to the County.

Our urban areas – which are receiving 90% of the growth – are thriving. Our cities are gaining 80% of the new population, creating 80% of the new housing, and providing 95% of the jobs in the County. Rural areas are being preserved as intended in the King County Comprehensive Plan.

Although the recession continues in King County, there have been minor, but notable improvements – such as new construction and a strong housing market. Long range prospects for economic recovery are strong. Our median income is \$53,000 within the cities of King County.

Based upon the King County Executive Annexation Initiative, there has been considerable focus on the County's unincorporated territory. More than 220,000 people live in our unincorporated areas – most of whom reside within PAAs of Issaquah, Renton, Federal Way, Auburn, Kent, Tukwila, and Kirkland. There are two PAAs – West Hill and North Highline – which are not assigned to any city at this time.

The majority of the PAAs comprise primarily residential areas – there is little commercial land. The residents earn a median income of \$65,000 and are comfortable with the existing lifestyle and regional governance that is provided to them. There is no substantial interest in joining cities.

At the request of Board members, Mr. Felt also provided information about the following issues:

- **Demographics:** Based upon the 2000 National Census, Mr. Felt reported that the demographic profile of King County is essentially stable. There has been a slight increase in the following groups: single-person households; senior households; couples with no children, and single parents. There has been a slight decrease in household of couples with children,
- **Affordable Housing:** Mr. Felt reported that the County Plan provides policies encouraging affordable housing. However, there is little funding to support construction or access to low-income, subsidized housing. There is some market rate “affordable” housing. Economics is the driving factor with respect to housing construction, insurance, and operations management. King County is grappling with housing related issues – and looking for innovative, fiscally responsible solutions to this challenge.

Karen Wolf, of the King County Executive Office and Paul Reitenbach (DDES) provided an Orientation to the King County Comprehensive Plan.2004 Update.

Ms. Wolf and Mr. Reitenbach spoke of the GMA directive for periodic review of the Comprehensive Plan to ensure that the Plan remains a valid tool for guiding the long-range growth and development of the urban communities and the preservation of our rural/resource areas. GMA requires a major plan review each 10 years and permits a “fine-tuning” each four years. The proposed update comes at a confluence of the 4-year and the 10-year review period. As such, the update addresses each of the Comprehensive Plan elements.

Ms. Wolf and Mr. Reitenbach provided a brief overview of the goals and processes for the update of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed updates have been provided to local communities – and to citizens groups -- for discussion and comment. The policies will also be reviewed by the Growth Management Planning Council – which is the agency responsible for setting the Plan framework and implementation tools. The target date for approval of the revision is March, 2004.

Ms. Wolf and Mr. Reitenbach noted that the proposed Comprehensive Plan has several areas of major changes with respect to policies addressing urban growth areas, annexations, land uses in urban and rural areas, and service concurrency (e.g., transportation).

While the existing Urban Growth Area boundaries provide ample land to support housing, employment, and public services/facilities for the anticipated population, there is a need to move these urban areas from unincorporated King County into local jurisdictions. This transition is necessary to meet the intent of the GMA to provide citizens with local government. The transition is also necessary to enable King County to focus on regional services

Ms. Wolf and Mr. Reitenbach focused their remarks on sections of the Comprehensive Plan which are most closely related to the immediate responsibilities of the Boundary Review Board. They provided detailed information concerning proposed changes to the policies addressing Urban Growth Areas, Potential Annexation Areas, and Growth Targets.

For example, there was discussion of Chapter 2: Urban Communities (Section 1 – Urban Land Use/Urban Communities and Urban Growth Target Areas). Policies in this section define annexation areas and support urban growth areas as the focus of development of residential units and jobs. Services – transportation, utilities, and human services -- would be concentrated in these urban areas. These policies also provide for protection of rural areas and resource lands. This section of the Plan introduces the policies for growth targets and benchmarks.

Mr. Reitenbach and Ms. Wolf also presented Chapter 2: Section II – Potential Annexation Areas. Policies in this Section speak of annexation as necessary to provide for local governance and efficient essential public services. Annexation of urban unincorporated area is also described as good public policy – consistent with State and Regional goals. Further, the County’s fiscal constraints mandate annexation of urban unincorporated lands in the very near term.

Several policies – U-201 – U-208 establish the regulatory guidelines under which the County would support – or discourage – annexations. These policies also set more specific standards for annexations. For example, U 201 and U-202 call for the County and cities to work together to define Potential Annexation Areas (PAAs) and to facilitate annexation of lands within the Urban Growth Area (UGA). U-205 calls for the County and cities to jointly develop pre-annexation agreements to address the transition from regional to local governance.

Chair Denton invited comments on the presentation by Ms. Wolf and Mr. Reitenbach. Board members offered the following remarks:

- How do Boundary Review Board authorities and limitations relate to the proposed Comprehensive Plan policies?

The Board provides the only public forum in which citizens and jurisdictions can consider the benefits and costs of annexation. The Board reviews applications for annexation, but the Board cannot force annexations. Citizens must begin the annexation process – and many citizens prefer to remain in the County.

King County also does not have tools to force annexations. GMA does not provide a timeline for transition of unincorporated lands. GMA does not exact sanctions for failure to incorporate.

King County is working to provide incentives to encourage annexation of entire PAAs – or to establish phased annexation plans. The County has set aside some funds to aid in the transition from regional to local government. The County is eager to achieve these annexations to limit the need to expend scarce County General Funds to provide local services.

- How does the Comprehensive Plan define and address preservation of rural/resource lands?

It appears that development is beginning to occur – at a noteworthy rate – in rural areas. Should development be permitted in these areas? How can these lands be preserved or used as intended with the addition of development? Are the costs for serving these areas not significant? If so, how can this cost be accommodated?

Comprehensive Plan policies are provided to provide a balance which allows limited residential uses, while preserving substantial lands for open space or for strictly prescribed uses – e.g., forest management. Public services provided to rural residences are limited – e.g., secondary roadways. Much of the cost for these limited services is borne by the residents. Residents rely primarily on private roads, wells, and septic systems.

Ms. Wolf and Mr. Reitenbach will provide the Boundary Review Board with copies of the final adopted Comprehensive Plan – 2004.

IV MINUTES

Regular Meeting: Chair Denton presented the minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 12, 2004 for review and action by the Board members.

Action: Van Anderson moved and Roger Loschen seconded the motion to adopt the minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 12, 2004. The Board voted (nine in favor) to approve this record. Ethel Hanis abstained, as she did not attend the January 2004 Regular Meeting.

V. ADMINISTRATION

A. CHAIR'S REPORT

General Business

Chair Denton reported that the Board has been working on several projects, including: (1) coordinating programs with King County Executive/Council 2004 Work Program as it relates to the Boundary Review Board; (2) coordinating efforts with the State Association to develop

and implement a program for work with Legislature 2004; and (3) pre-development review for future Notices of Intention. Committee members and staff will report on each of these activities.

Chair Denton invited Special Assistant Attorney General Robert Kaufman to comment on the Supreme Court decision to reverse its opinion in the matter of Grant County v. City of Moses Lake. Mr. Kaufman reported that the Court, in its initial opinion, declared the most commonly used petition method of annexation to be unconstitutional by virtue of its granting privileges and immunities to property owners of more highly valued land. In the Court's current decision, the traditional petition method would be reinstated as a valid tool for achieving annexation.

The Court further reported its opinion that it is the Legislature which has the exclusive authority over annexations. This authority can be – but is not required to be – delegated to citizens. The precise meaning – and implications – of this decision are not clear. Adjudication may be necessary to achieve clarity.

Mr. Kaufman reported that jurisdictions which had Notices of Intention in process at the time of the Supreme Court's initial decision in March 2002 are seeking guidance on the current status of those applications. He stated that:

- Those jurisdictions with Notices of Intention which were before the Board with a review in process at the time of the Court's initial decision -- and which then were returned to the proposing jurisdiction – would need to be resubmitted to the Board.
- Those actions for which the Boundary Review Board had completed its review process – and which were stopped by the local jurisdiction prior to the adoption of the final resolution – could likely now go forward to final resolution. Local jurisdictions would need to make the decision concerning completion of the existing action or the preparation of a new Notice of Intention.
- In some instances, a Notice of Intention had been reviewed by the Boundary Review Board -- and permitted to go forward to the local jurisdiction for final resolution. The local jurisdiction chose to take the action to election and the action failed at election. Those proposals are now null and void. A new Notice of Intention would be required by the Boundary Review Board.

B. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Steering Committee/Budget Committee: Judy Tessandore reported that the Steering Committee and the Budget Committee have met to review the Board's Travel & Subsistence Budget Line. Board staff requested this review because – while the Board's total budget of \$232,000 is in good balance -- the Travel & Subsistence line has been exceeded in 2002 and 2003. Staff has provided internal transfers from other, undersubscribed budget lines, to meet the expenditures in the Travel & Subsistence Line. Although King County permits transfers between internal budget lines, the Board has responsibility for determining that this transfer policy and plan remains an acceptable budget management tool.,

Ms. Tessandore reported that the Committee considered the various elements of the Travel & Subsistence budget line including:

- Local travel by Board members and staff to Regular Meetings, Special Meetings, and Committee Meetings;
- Local travel by Board members and staff to WSBRB Association conferences, workshops and meetings;
- Local travel by Board members and staff to the State Legislature;
- Local and national travel to education and training programs

The Committee considered the following options for the Travel & Subsistence Budget Line:

- A request to King County for an increase in the Board's overall budget to enable increased funding for Travel & Subsistence
- Formal reassignment of funds from underutilized budget lines – e.g., GIS services.
- Continuing the current system of “as needed” reassignment of funds from underutilized budget lines – e.g., GIS services.
- Reduce participation -- and/or shared travel costs -- in professional development programs (e.g., WAPA Conference, APA National Conference).
- Reduce representation at state-wide and local education programs (e.g., State Association, Legal Seminars Institute, Land Use Policy Institute.)
- Reduce or eliminate funding for meals in conjunction with Regular Meetings;

The Committee noted that the Board has traditionally had unexpended funds at the end of each year – and that those funds are returned to King County. Therefore, there does not appear to be justification for seeking additional funds for the Board. There is a risk in making a formal reassignment of funds from a specific budget line (e.g., GIS funding) because there may be a need for use of all funds within that line in a future year. Reduction of costs for educational activities – e.g., conferences, dinner meetings – could limit the ability of members and staff to be fully informed concerning laws, policies, and programs which affect the Board.

Thus, the Committee has come to the conclusion that the current system of making informal transfers into the Travel & Subsistence Budget Line is a reasonable system for funding Board activities. Transfers are limited and the process is being managed in accord with County regulations and Board policies. The Committee recommends sustaining the existing Travel & Subsistence funding plan in order to recognize the value to the Boundary Review Board resulting from professional education and development.

Legislative Committee: Roger Loschen and Lenora Blauman reported that King County officials, the Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC), the Association of Washington Cities (AWC), the special purpose district agencies, and the Washington State Boundary Review Board Association have been continuing to work actively with the State Legislature for the 2004 General Session – both to propose and to respond to pending legislation.

The State Association visited Olympia in late January. Roger Loschen and Lenora Blauman represented King County. The Association Executive Board hosted an Orientation Program at which Fred Jarrett was the keynote speaker. Mr. Jarrett spoke about the key items on the agenda for this session – the budget, primary elections, and a small number of health and safety matters. Some growth management bills are also of interest to the Legislature.

Association members did not have an opportunity to work as an “advance team” to review bills and to develop written issue papers. However, the members did work as a group to review bills as they were dropped and to develop a strategy for response to relevant proposed legislation. Members attended public hearings concerning bills of interest to the Boundary Review Boards. Testimony was provided as approved by the Association team.

Members also had meetings with the members of the House Local Government Committee and the Senate Land Use Committee.

The Association has also been working with the American Planning Association Legislative Team. The APA team has been most supportive of the Association position with respect to bills which affect the annexation application process and the annexation review process.

Mike Ryherd, the legislative consultant for APA, has also been assisting our State Association in Olympia. The Association and the APA have worked closely together to ensure that there is no conflict of interest in work with the Legislature.

Several specific bills of interest to our State Association and, particularly to King County have been dropped during this session. However, February 6 was the final date to forward bills from Committee to the Rules – those bills not making it to the Rules Committee are now dead for this session. Four bills that the Association has been tracking are still viable:

SHB 2593: Representative Moeller introduced a bill to the House Land Use Committee to allow cities and counties to annex territory by interlocal agreement. This bill had originally been written to establish interlocal agreements as the only method by which to accomplish annexations. In addition, the bill removed the Boundary Review Board from review of all annexations. The Association testified in opposition to this bill.

A substitute bill was passed from the committee to establish interlocal agreements as one additional method of annexation. Further the revised bill does not include the section that had originally eliminated Boards from review of all city annexations. The substitute bill does eliminate Board review for those annexations accomplished by interlocal agreement. This bill was referred to the House Rules Committee.

The Association continues to have concerns about the lack of provisions for public review and for review by special purpose districts of annexations accomplished by interlocal agreement. More specifically, while the annexation agreement is between the city and county, the fact is that -- in most counties -- special purpose districts provide services (water, sewer, fire) to unincorporated areas and are very much affected by the timing and magnitude of the annexation. As Boundary Review Board would no longer have any authority to review a city annexation, there is no opportunity for independent public review. More specifically the Boards provide an impartial forum for citizens; create a forum in which decisions are based on clear objectives; resolve disputes between cities, county, and special districts; and provide a mechanism for jurisdictions to coordinate. Where does this happen without the BRB? This legislation leaves no mechanism, other than the court system, for districts to be a part of the annexation decisions.

HB 3068: This bill which was crafted by – and for – King County was introduced by Sandra Romero and Judy Clibborn to the House Local Government Committee.

This bill directs the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED) to undertake an extensive study of annexation issues in King, Pierce, Snohomish, Kitsap, Thurston and Clark Counties. Initiated by King County, the study would conclude by November 30, 2004 and submit findings to the legislature.

The bill intends to require CTED to conduct studies of cities to identify and evaluate city resources and municipal progress in annexation of urban lands. The bill intends for counties to use CTED's study findings to determine city's resources and plans for annexation. The bill would then permit counties to determine when cities would undertake annexation of urban areas based upon the county's determination of a city's readiness to govern and serve that specific urban area.

Further, the bill intends to establish new funding tools for annexations (e.g. taxation authorities, capital funding).

The bill also intends to streamline the annexation process - streamlining would include changes to the GMA and to incorporation standards to facilitate annexations. The bill calls for other strategies to facilitate annexation – including the modification or elimination of the public review process – and, thus, the potential elimination of the boundary review board.

More specifically, King County is seeking annexation of all urban areas by 2007 in order to reduce costs for services to these areas. The County intends to use the CTED study data to determine cities' available resources (and thus readiness) to annex. Then the County intends to use the streamlined annexation processes to require cities to annex lands on a timeline set by the County.

The Association has provided a position paper stating that HB 3068 is directed at resolving regional issues (King County) that would be better addressed by the affected local governments rather than by the State Legislature.

This bill has been combined with SHB 2805 which sets up a blue ribbon commission to look at local government finance and land use. Both were referred to the House Appropriations Committee.

SHB 2384 This bill was introduced by special purpose district officials to the House Local Government Committee. The legislation would require an election for water-sewer district assumptions by cities. Citizens throughout the entire district -- both within the area to be assumed and the area to remain with the district -- would vote on the assumption. The proposal would extend the voting requirement to all districts serving more than 5,000 residents, regardless of the amount of its land or valuation lying outside the city's boundaries.

The Association has provided comment on this bill. While the Association favors citizen participation -- including the opportunity to vote on matters which will affect their community -- HB 2384 does not appear to be a necessary or reasonable piece of legislation.

More specifically, existing law on assumption of jurisdiction of water-sewer districts by cities is based upon location and valuation. This legislation would add a third factor -- population.

There is currently a public review process in place -- both before the Boundary Review Board and within the local city/district boundaries. For example, a vote is required if less than 60% of the valuation and geographic area of the district falls outside of the corporate limits of a city seeking to assume jurisdiction.

This additional process is believed by the majority of respondents to constitute an additional (redundant), unnecessary, unreasonable, and potentially expensive requirement.

It has been further suggested that failure at election -- which would be likely under the provisions of HB 2384 -- would create service and fiscal challenges to cities and districts. This additional process would, therefore, be inconsistent with the State Growth Management Act -- which supports municipal assumption of special purpose districts. The King County Comprehensive Plan, similarly, supports municipalities as service providers.

Each of the above-referenced bills would eventually be referred to the Senate Land Use Committee chaired by Senator Joyce Mulliken.

According to Mike Ryherd, the recent Supreme Court decision -- which has provided another viable petition method for annexation -- has altered the interest of the Legislature in annexation-related legislation. Legislators believe that the restoration of the traditional annexation method has reduced the previously perceived importance for making revisions to the annexation application process or review process to facilitate removal of unincorporated areas from counties. Therefore, there is limited likelihood that any of the currently proposed annexation-related bills will be approved this year.

However, Mr. Ryherd and Dave Williams of the Association of Washington Cities (AWC) believe that there will be considerable effort dedicated to a review of the entire annexation process -- from petition to public review -- during the remainder of 2004. The goal of this group is to present a streamlined annexation review package to Legislature 2005. The State Association may seek a place at the table for the discussions concerning annexation review.

The Legislature is also considering numerous bills which would revise the Growth Management Act and supporting legislation. These bills address:

- Best Available Science
- Updating Comprehensive Plans and Development Regulations
- Industrial Land Banks
- Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development
- Flexibility for Washington Farms
- Growth Management Hearings Boards

For more information on pending or moribund legislation you may access the Association Legislative Web Site at http://www.wsbrb.org/BRB%20Leg_tracking.htm. This site is updated on a daily basis.

C. EXECUTIVE SECRETARY'S REPORT

King County Budget – 2005: The County Council has been provided with an initial briefing from the Executive Office of Management and Budget preparatory to planning for the General Fund Budget for 2005. The Boundary Review Board is included in the General Fund Budget.

For 2004 the County's General Fund expenditures are projected to be \$513 million – 18% of the County's total \$2.9 billion budget. By law, the County budget must be balanced each year. The budget is balanced for 2004 – but shortfalls are anticipated for 2005 and 2006 – of approximately \$20 million per year. The budgets for those years must be "recalibrated" so as to achieve a balance.

The challenge for achievement of such a balance results from the fact that the County's revenues are growing at a rate of approximately 2%, while expenditures are growing at a rate of 6%. Absent a significant new source of funding – or a substantial reduction of costs -- there will be a structural crisis to the General Fund. Much of the Council effort in the coming months will be devoted to the creation of a new design for County structure and function.

Boundary Review Board Annual Briefing to the King County Council: Mrs. Blauman provided an update on plans for the Annual Briefing to the County Council. At present, there are three separate, but complementary, activities underway related to this Briefing.

- *Briefing of Individual Council Members:* Preparatory to the Briefing for the Council Committee of the Whole, Mrs. Blauman and various Board members have been meeting with several individual Council members. The various purposes of these meetings are to:
 - provide basic information about the Board; and/or
 - answer questions; and/or
 - listen to ideas and concerns with respect to the Boundary Review Board.

Individual briefings were offered to new Council members; to members who chair committees which have a specific interest in the Board (e.g., Growth Management and Unincorporated Areas; Regional Planning, Legislative, Budget); and to members who raised issues about the Board during the Council's budget planning sessions.

Meetings have been conducted with Bob Ferguson, Carolyn Edmonds, Dow Constantine, Dwight Pelz, and Larry Gossett. The meetings have been very productive. Council member Ferguson appreciated an introduction to the Board. Dwight Pelz both offered his support for the Board and asked good questions reiterated his concern was were

In addition to the benefits inherent in providing information and in building networks with council members, the Board was able to learn about interests of Council members – and that information will assist in the developing of a streamlined, targeted presentation to the Committee of the Whole.

- *Council Staff Briefing:* The Office of the King County Executive has been invited to make a presentation to the Council Staff and Aides concerning the King County Budget Advisory Task Force Report (BATF). The BATF Report recommended that County encourage annexation of all unincorporated urban areas. The recommendation was proffered as a means to meet the Growth Management Act policies supporting local governance. The annexation of urban lands is also viewed as a major tool to enhance the County's ability to provide Regional Services by reducing the lands governed by the County and, therefore, the citizens requiring local services from the County. The BATF Report was the genesis for the County's Annexation Initiative – a program that will provide incentives for cities which annex unincorporated territories.

County Council staff and aides must be familiar with the Annexation Initiative in order to serve the County Council as the Council implements this program.

The Office of the Executive has invited the Boundary Review Board to participate in this presentation – which will take place on February 13, 2004. The presentation will include:

- The King County budget plans and funding issues.
- The purpose and structure of the Annexation Initiative.
- Growth management laws and plans as they affect local governance and service provision.
- Annexation laws, processes, and issues.
- The role of King County in the annexation process.
- The role of local jurisdictions in the annexation process.
- The role of the Boundary Review Board in the annexation process.
- King County's proposed annexation schedule and the local jurisdictions' current plans for (or level of interest in) annexation of unincorporated areas.

- *Committee of the Whole Briefing:* Lenora Blauman reported that she is continuing to prepare materials for the Annual Briefing – updated from previous approved briefings – for the upcoming meeting. Briefing materials include basic information (e.g., enabling legislation, mission, statement of principles), an activities report, work program, a Q&A section, and illustrative maps.

The briefing will provide information about the Board's role and responsibility for public review of incorporations, annexations, mergers, and other actions. A brief summary of Boundary Review Board regulatory authorities, activities, and future work program will be included in that presentation. The briefing is also intended to provide an opportunity for Council members and Council staff to share questions and concerns with the Board.

The materials will integrate information learned from meetings with individual Council members and from the Council Staff briefing. Draft materials will be reviewed by two Board members who have volunteered as editors. The materials will then be shared with the Steering Committee preparatory to finalization for the Briefing.

The briefing date for the entire Council remains tentatively scheduled for March, 2004.

Mrs. Blauman reported that, at the conclusion of the Briefings, the Board may wish to consider adapting the Information Packet as a public relations document to provide to cities, special purpose districts, citizens, and to legislators considering the future role of our Boundary Review Board.

These public relations materials may serve as a useful tool to provide information to King County, AWC, WSAC, special purpose districts, and other stakeholders. The information may be valuable as these various groups consider legislation that could have significant effects upon Boundary Review Board authorities and responsibilities. More specifically, the King County officials and Association of Washington Cities officials are giving consideration to proposing legislation that could modify – or eliminate – the Board’s role in the review of annexations, incorporations, and, perhaps, other actions.

D. CORRESPONDENCE

Correspondence was reviewed briefly. No questions or issues were raised with respect to the substance of the correspondence.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. NOTICES OF INTENTION

File No. 2159 – City of Redmond Mage Annexation: Mrs. Blauman provided a brief description of the Notice of Intention.

Board members did not raise questions or concerns with respect to the substance of the Notice of Intention.

File 2164: Ronald Water District – Shorewood I & II Annexation: Mrs. Blauman provided a brief description of the Notice of Intention.

Board members did not raise questions or concerns with respect to the substance of the Notice of Intention.

B. PENDING FILES

- | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| - Auburn | - Covington |
| - Kent | - Ronald Sewer District |
| - Woodinville | - Kirkland |
| - Federal Way | - Redmond |
| - Renton (7 files) | - Snoqualmie |
| - Tukwila | |

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Action: Van Anderson moved and Lloyd Baker seconded a motion to adjourn the Boundary Review Board Regular Meeting. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.